

E

440

.G 7

THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY



3 1151 02743 6553



ADAMS MEMORIAL FUND

THE GREAT ISSUE

TO BE DECIDED IN NOVEMBER NEXT!

SHALL THE
CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION
STAND OR FALL,
SHALL SECTIONALISM TRIUMPH?

LINCOLN AND HIS SUPPORTERS

BEHOLD THE RECORD!

AN awful responsibility rests upon the voters of this country! A great, a fearful, a VITAL ISSUE is to be decided by them on the 6th day of November next! Through the ballot-box, before the Supreme Ruler of the Universe (we speak most reverently), and in the eyes of the civilized world, the citizens of this great country will be called upon to decide whether the Constitution and the Union our fathers made shall stand or fall—whether this great Government, the freest and the best the sun of Heaven ever shone upon—shall go on in its high career of prosperity and renown, or be torn asunder by civil war! Disguise it as you may, union or disunion is the question to be decided in November. No man with a thimbleful of brains in his head can fail to see that the triumph of a *sectional* party, whose avowed object is to war upon the institutions of the other half of the Confederacy, leads inevitably to a dissolution of the Union. Hence it was that the Father of his Country warned us to beware of sectional parties, and to indignantly frown upon the first attempt to alienate one section of the Union from the other. "A house divided against itself cannot stand," holds true in the political as well as the religious world. This war of one section upon the other section can have but one end—the disruption of the Confederacy. If continued, it must lead to estrangement, then hatred, then open and violent altercations, and then the dissolution of the bonds that bind us together as one people. How happily and how truly did the great statesman of Kentucky, HENRY CLAY, express this idea in a speech in the Senate, on the 7th of February, 1839:—

"Sir, I am not in the habit of speaking lightly of the possibility of dissolving this happy Union. The Senate know that I have deprecated allusions, on ordinary occasions, to that direful event. The country will testify that, if there be anything in the history of my public career worthy of recollection, it is the truth and sincerity of my ardent devotion to its lasting preservation. But we should be false in our allegiance if we did not discriminate between the imaginary and real dangers by which it may be assailed. *Abolitionism should no longer be regarded as an imaginary danger. The abolitionists, let me suppose, succeed in their present aim of uniting the inhabitants of the free States, as one man, against the inhabitants of the slave States. Union on one side will beget Union on the other, and this process of reciprocal consolidation will be attended with all the violent prejudice, embittered passions, and implacable animosities which ever degraded or deformed human nature. . . . One section will stand in menacing and hostile array against the other. The collision of opinion will be quickly followed by the clash of arms. I will not attempt to describe scenes which now happily lie concealed from our view. Abolitionists themselves would shrink back in dismay and horror at the contemplation of desolated fields, conflagrated cities, murdered inhabitants, and the overthrow of the fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man.*"

How sadly true, nay, how prophetic, also, are these words of Mr. Clay. The triumph of sectionalism is the downfall of the Republic. To preserve the Union we must keep the bond our fathers made, and crush out and exterminate this hydra-headed monster of aboli-

tionism. The man who casts his vote for Lincoln, in that act, deliberately, solemnly, and knowingly, votes for a dissolution of the American Union! There is no dodging this position. What are the principles of that sectional party, and what the utterances of the men who formed, lead, and control it? Behold the record!

Before proceeding to the record, however, let us see how, in the speech from which we have already quoted, Mr. Clay sums up the designs of the abolitionists:—

"And the third class are the real ultra abolitionists, who are resolved to persevere in the pursuit of their object at all hazards. With this class the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the prohibition of the removal of slaves from State to State, and the refusal to admit any new State comprising within its limits the institution of domestic slavery, are but so many means conducing to the accomplishment of the *ultimate but perilous end at which they avowedly and boldly aim, are but so many short stages in the long and bloody road to the distant goal at which they would finally arrive. Their purpose is abolition—universal abolition; peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must.*"

How graphically descriptive of the Black-Republican party of the present day! The picture is true to life.

LINCOLN AND HIS SUPPORTERS IN FAVOR OF THE HIDEOUS DOCTRINE OF NEGRO EQUALITY!

On the 16th of October, 1854, Abraham Lincoln delivered a speech at Peoria, Illinois, in which he used the following language:—

"What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man *without the other's consent*. I say this is the leading principle, the SHEET ANCHOR of *American Republicanism*. Our Declaration of Independence says:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident,—that all men are *created equal*; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, DERIVING THEIR JUST POWER FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED."

"I have quoted so much at this time merely to show that according to our ancient faith, the powers of Government are derived from the consent of the governed. Now, the relation of master and slave is, *pro tanto*, a total violation of this principle. The master not only governs the slave without his consent, but he governs him by a set of rules altogether different from those which he prescribes for himself. Allow ALL the governed an EQUAL VOICE IN THE GOVERNMENT; and that, and that only, is self-government."—Howell's Life of Lincoln, page 279.

Again, in a speech delivered in Chicago, during the last presidential election, which we find published in the Illinois State Journal, the State organ of the Black Republican party of Illinois, on the 16th of September, 1856, Mr. Lincoln said:

"That central idea, in our political opinion, at the beginning was, and until recently continued to be, the *equality of men*. And, although it was always submitted patiently to whatever inequality there seemed to be as a matter of actual necessity, its constant working has been a steady progress toward the PRACTICAL EQUALITY OF ALL MEN.

"Let past differences as nothing be; and, with steady eye on the real issue, let us re-inaugurate the good old *central ideas* of the Republic. We can do it. The human heart is with us; God is with us. We shall again be able not to declare that all the States, as States, are equal, nor yet that all citizens, as citizens, are equal, but renew the broader, better declaration, including both these and much more, that all *men* are created equal."

Yet again, in his speech at Chicago, on the 10th of July, 1858, Mr. Lincoln said:

"I should like to know if, taking the old Declaration of Independence, which declares that **ALL** men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? IF ONE MAN SAYS IT DOES NOT MEAN A NEGRO, WHY NOT ANOTHER SAY IT DOES NOT MEAN SOME OTHER MAN? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it and tear it out. Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out! [Cries of "No, no!"] *Let us stick to it, then, let us stand firmly by it, then. * * * * Let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position—discarding the standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land until we shall once more stand up declaring that ALL MEN are created equal. * * * * I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms UNTIL THERE SHALL NO LONGER BE A DOUBT THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED FREE AND EQUAL."*

See the volume of the debates between Lincoln and Douglas, which have been revised by Mr. Lincoln since his nomination for the presidency, pages 23, 24. Salmon P. Chase, twice elected Governor of Ohio, and elected last winter United States Senator from that State, by the Black Republican party, was presented with a silver pitcher by the negroes of Cincinnati on the 6th of May, 1845. In response to the presentation, he said:

"In what I have done I cannot claim to have acted from any peculiar consideration of the colored people as a separate and distinct class in the community, but from the simple conviction that all the individuals of that class are members of the community, and, in virtue of their manhood, entitled to EVERY ORIGINAL RIGHT ENJOYED BY ANY OTHER MEMBER. We feel, therefore, that all LEGAL DISTINCTION between individuals of the same community, founded in any such circumstances as color, origin, and the like, are hostile to the genius of our institutions, and incompatible with the true theory of American liberty. SLAVERY and oppression must CEASE, or American liberty must perish.

"In Massachusetts, and in most, if not all, the New England States, the colored man and the white are absolutely equal before the law.

"In New York the colored man is restricted as to the right of suffrage by a property qualification. In other respects the same equality prevails.

"I embrace with pleasure this opportunity of declaring MY DISAPPROBATION of that clause of the Constitution which denies to a portion of the colored people the right of suffrage.

"True Democracy makes no inquiry about the color of the skin or place of nativity, or any other similar circumstance of condition. I regard therefore the EXCLUSION of the colored people as a body from the elective franchise as INCOMPATIBLE with true Democratic principles."

The Hon. Henry Wilson, United States Senator from Massachusetts, in a speech delivered in the Senate on the 5th of May, 1858, said :

"Now, Mr. President, I live in a Commonwealth that recognizes the ABSOLUTE AND PERFECT EQUALITY of all men of all races. A mulatto or negro in the State I represent is not only a citizen of the State; he not only has the right to vote, but, if the people choose to do it, they may elect him to any office in their gift."—Cong. Globe, 1st sess. 35th Cong., page 1966.

In 1856, Senator Wilson said :

"Sir, I am proud to live in a Commonwealth where every man, black or white, of every clime and race, is recognized as a man, standing upon the terms of PERFECT AND ABSOLUTE EQUALITY before the laws."—App. Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 34th Cong., page 393.

Senator Wilson made a mistake when he stated that there was perfect equality in Massachusetts. Such is not the case. By the laws of that State, a foreigner cannot vote in it for two years after he has been naturalized and a citizen of the State, while a negro, under the same law, acquires a vote in one year!

On a former occasion (page 1964) Mr. Fessenden, the Black Republican Senator from Maine, held forth in this wise :

"By the laws of Maine, and under the Constitution of the State of Maine, free negroes are citizens—just as much citizens in the State of Maine as white men. It has been so solemnly decided by the highest tribunal of our State since the decision of the Dred Scott case. The Supreme Court of Maine has decided that they are entitled to all the privileges—that they stand upon a PERFECT EQUALITY with white men—under the Constitution and laws of that State. They are voters, and recognized as citizens under the terms of the Constitution, which allows any citizen to vote."

Here we have the Black Republican Supreme Court of Maine actually nullifying the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; so intense in their love for the negro! Is this not enough to startle and alarm every lover of his country?

Now listen to Cassius M. Clay, who was the chief competitor against Hamlin for the nomination for the Vice-Presidency in the Chicago convention :

"Our legislatures, State and Federal, should raise the platform upon which our free colored people stand: they should give to them full political rights to hold office, to vote, to sit on juries, to give their testimony, and to make no distinction between them and ourselves. The instrument called the Constitution, after pronouncing all men equal, and having equal rights, suffers slavery to exist, a free colored person to be denied all political rights, and after declaring that all persons shall enjoy a free intercourse with the States, suffers the free negro to be driven out of all, and excluded from such rights. Deliver me from such an instrument thus partial, thus unjust, that can be thus perverted, and made to sanction prejudices and party feelings, and note the accidental distinction of color."

This Black Republican maniac raves at the Constitution because it does not guaranty the equality of the negro with the white man!

Now, let us hear from Horace Greeley, "the chief cook and bottle-washer" in the Chicago convention, whose efforts there brought about the nomination of Lincoln. As far back as the 17th of January, 1851, Greeley thus spoke in his *Tribune* :

"We loathe and detest all laws which give or withhold political rights on account of color. 'A man's a man for a' that,' and ought to have the full rights of manhood, whether his ancestors were Celts, Goths, or Hottentots, whether his complexion be ebony or ivory. * * * All constitutional exclusions of any class from the polls, the jury-box, &c., because of color, are aristocratic, unjust, and infamous."

Again, in 1855, we see him proposing and urging the nomination for Congress of that notorious negro, Fred. Douglass. Just listen to him :

"Among the candidates put up by the convention of the liberly party at Utica, on Wednesday, is Mr. Frederick Douglass, of Monroe county, who is nominated for the office of Secretary of State with respect to ability, *a better nomination could hardly be desired*; but we confess that we should regret to see Mr. Douglass elected. *His proper place is not a member of the State administration at Albany, but as a member of Congress at Washington.* For the former office he possesses no qualifications that might not be found in other gentlemen, *while for the duties of a representative at Washington he is particularly gifted.* As an orator and debator he possesses both the force and the grace of a Virginia gentleman of the old school and one of the first families, to which a great depth of conviction and a resolution worthy of the best days of the Republic, add a persuasive and magnetic charm not often felt in the Federal Capitol. We trust, then, that the friends of Mr. Douglass will not persist in urging his election to the office for which he is nominated, *but will make every preparation to return him to Congress on the very first vacancy in the Monroe district.*"

In the Tribune of Sept. 17th, 1860, Greely thus speaks in regard to the right of the negro to vote:

"Understand clearly that the question of allowing or forbidding Negroes to vote in our State is not before the people. Let the result this Fall be as it may, Negroes will continue to be voters in our State. *The simple question to be decided by the people is—Shall a very inconsiderable fraction of our people continue to be deprived of the Right of Suffrage for want of \$250 worth of dirt? If so, on what principle? Their black skins do not in any event disfranchise them: Shall their poverty do so?*"

Now, hear the old apostle of Black Republicanism, Joshua R. Giddings. In his speech in the House, December 18, 1855, Mr. Giddings said:

"This Government was founded for the purpose, design, and end of 'securing all men under its jurisdiction in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and happiness.' It is now placed in our hands. *On this rock the Republican church was founded, and I speak reverently when I say 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'* * * When we say 'all men are thus endowed,' we mean what we say. We do not refer particularly to the high or the low, the rich or the poor, *the negro, the mulatto, or the white*, but *all men* who bear the image of God and are endowed with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

When questioned in the House of Representatives, the Hon. N. P. Banks, afterwards elected Speaker of the House, and Governor of Massachusetts, by the Black Republicans, declared his inability to decide whether the white or the black was the superior race, but leave the question to be decided by *absorption or amalgamation!* He said:

"So far as he had studied the subject of races, he had adopted the idea that when there is a weaker race in existence, it will succumb to, and be absorbed in, the stronger race. This was the universal law as regarded the races of men in the world. *In regard to the question, whether the white or the black race was superior, he proposed to wait until time should develop whether the white race should absorb the black, or THE BLACK ABSORB THE WHITE.*"

In this country the doctrine of negro equality presents itself in a twofold aspect. To the people of the North it says: "You must strike down all laws which erect a barrier between you and the black man; he is your equal, entitled to vote, hold office, sit at the same table with you, and marry your daughters. You must give him the same political and social rights you enjoy, for he is your equal and entitled to them!" Are the people of the North prepared for this? If yea, vote for Abraham Lincoln; he is committed to the odious doctrine.

To the people of the South negro equality says: "You must free your negroes and give them all the rights you now enjoy, for they are your equals and entitled to their freedom and the political and social privileges enjoyed by you." Negro equality means the *abolition of slavery*; it can have no other meaning. If the Republican leaders are sincere in their opinions that the negro is entitled to his freedom, as honest men, when they get the power, they will strive to give him that freedom. If they are sincere in their opinions that the negro is entitled to social and political equality with the white man, as honest men, when they are installed in power, they will strive to give him that equality.

In regard to the Declaration of Independence giving any color to this hideous doctrine of negro equality, it is a sufficient answer to say that when it was drafted every State in this Union but one were slaveholding States; and it is arrant humbug to say that these States would have thus made a declaration amounting to a virtual emancipation of their slaves. Indeed, lest this idea should receive any countenance, the word "free," which was in the original draft of the Declaration, *was stricken out.* The "all men" in it is of a piece with "We, the people," in the Constitution of the United States, and refers alone to white men. Nobody contends that the Constitution gives the black "*people*" the right of suffrage, of holding office, and of social and political equality. No more does the "all men" in the Declaration give them these privileges. This is essentially a government of white men, made for white men, and ruled by white men, all of whom are "equal."

LINCOLN AND HIS SUPPORTERS IN FAVOR OF THE "IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT!"

We believe Mr. Lincoln claims to be the author of the "irrepressible conflict" idea. At least, we find him giving it utterance in his speech at Springfield, Illinois, on the 17th of June, 1858. We quote from the volume of debates between Lincoln and Douglas, page 1. Mr. Lincoln said:

"We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. *'A house divided against itself cannot stand.'* I believe this Government CANNOT ENDURE PERMANENTLY half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will CEASE TO BE DIVIDED. IT WILL BECOME ALL ONE THING OR ALL THE OTHER. Either the opponents of slavery will ARREST the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ULTIMATE EXTINCTION, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

How little this man understands the true theory of our Government—the theory that established State governments to make laws to meet the exigencies, condition, climate, soil, &c., of each State, and to regulate their own affairs in their own way. There is no division of the house against itself in the Constitution; it exists only in the efforts of such fanatics as Abraham Lincoln to create strife, stir up discords, set brother against brother, and father against son, in our great and happy household of confederated States.

Four months after Mr. Lincoln's speech we find the Hon. Wm. H. Seward, the great leader of the Black Republican party, expressing the same idea in his speech at Rochester, N. Y.:

"Thus, these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results. Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. *It is an IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT BETWEEN OPPOSING AND ENDURING FORCES, and it means that the United States MUST AND WILL, sooner or later, become entirely a slaveholding nation or entirely a free-labor nation.* Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina, and the sugar plantations of Louisiana, will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more a market for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free States, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromise, when made, VAIN AND EPHEMERAL."

Gov. Chase, of Ohio, is another advocate of the "irrepressible conflict." A few days ago, at Pontiac, Michigan, he thus stated the issue, or rather his conception of the issue between the parties:

"I ask you to take sides and decide where you will be. 'If the Lord be God, then serve him; but if Baal, then serve him.' If slavery is right; if capital ought to own labor; then go for the doctrine openly. If you believe that freedom is the right of man, then join the party which has inscribed on the folds of its banner, 'FREEDOM THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY'S WIDE DOMAIN.'"

It may be well to add that we know of no party, save the black Republicans, that contends for this issue. The Democratic party is fighting for the constitutional rights of *all* sections—for the Constitution as it is, and for the Union as it is. They have nothing to do with slavery or anti-slavery. They do not proclaim "Slavery throughout the country's wide domain," nor do they proclaim "Freedom throughout the country's wide domain," for the simple reason that the Constitution leaves that question to be settled and decided by the people of each State, and each Territory when they come to form a State constitution preparatory to their admission into the Union, for themselves. Governor Chase would break down and trample under foot this solemn and salutary obligation of the Constitution, for in no other way could his party unfurl the banner of "Freedom throughout the country's wide domain."

Hon. George W. Julian, once a member of Congress from Indiana, and at this time the Republican candidate for Congress in the banner black Republican district in that State, at a Fremont meeting in Greenville, Darke County, Ohio, on the 10th of September, 1856, thus delivered himself:

"It is no use to deny it any longer. Our Republican party is a sectional party, because the South has forced us into it. The stumblers of this old-line, horse-stealing democracy, not having the fear of God before their eyes, charge us with being sectional. *I tell you we are a sectional party.* It is

not alone a fight between the North and the South. *It is a fight between freedom and slavery—between God and the devil—between Heaven and hell.*"

On the 16th of January, 1855, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, the pet of the black Republicans of Brooklyn, New York, in a lecture in New York City, on the subject of cutting the North from the South, said :

"All attempts at evasion, at adjourning, at concealing and compromising, are in vain. The reason of our long agitation is, not that restless abolitionists are abroad, that ministers will meddle with improper thomes, that parties are disregardful of their country's interest. These are symptoms only, not the disease; the effects, not the causes.

"Two great powers that will not live together are in our midst, and tugging at each other's throats. They will search each other out, though you separate them a hundred times. And if by an insane blindness you shall contrive to put off the issue, and send this unsettled dispute down to your children, it will go down, gathering volume and strength at every step, to waste and desolate their heritage. Let it be settled now. Clear the place. Bring in the champions. Let them put their lances in rest for the charge. Sound the trumpet; and God save the right!"

In his speech in the Senate, June 4, 1860, Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, thus reiterates the "irrepressible conflict" doctrine :

"Senators sometimes announce that they resist slavery on political grounds only, and remind us that they say nothing of the moral question. This is wrong. Slavery must be resisted not only on political grounds, but on all other grounds, whether social, economical, or moral. Ours is no holiday contest; nor is it any strife of rival factions; of White and Red roses; of theatric Nevi and Bianchi; *but it is a solemn battle between Right and Wrong—between Good and Evil.*"

Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio, in a speech in the House of Representatives, May 16, 1854, said :

"Mr. Chairman, it has become obvious to all that these conflicting institutions of freedom and slavery cannot flourish together under the same Government. *They can never be reconciled. They ever have been, they are now, and ever will be, at war with each other. Virtue and crime will not commingle; Heaven and hell cannot be at peace.*"

The Rev. Edmund H. Sears is an ardent Black Republican. He preached a sermon on the 15th of June, 1856, for the cause, which was afterwards published as a Republican campaign document. From that sermon, thus indorsed, we quote :

"There is no peace for the country, no safety for Northern institutions, *UNTIL SLAVERY IS DISLODGED from the national organism*; until the Government of the country is wielded for liberty, righteousness, and civilization, and not for oppression, unrighteousness and barbarism."

The Hon. John Wentworth, an ex-member of Congress from Illinois, and at present the Black Republican mayor of Chicago, in an article in his paper, the Chicago Democrat, glorifying over Frank Blair's election in St. Louis, says :

"While *the great doctrine of the duty of the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT to make the 'STATES ALL FREE'* thus receives indorsement in a slaveholding State, shall the Republicans of the free States lower their standard of principle?"

"The day of compromising, half-way measures has gone by. The year of jubilee has come. *Already is the child born who shall live to see the last shackle fall from the limbs of the slave on this continent.* UNIVERSAL EMANCIPATION IS NEAR AT HAND. The Republicans have thrown their banners to the breeze, inscribed with Lincoln's glorious words, 'THE STATES MUST BE MADE ALL FREE,' and under it will march on to victory after victory, conquering and to conquer."

This doctrine also leads to the "long and bloody road" of abolition. If, indeed, there be an "irrepressible conflict" between slavery and freedom; if, indeed, this be the issue in conflict; if, indeed, the one or the other must triumph and the other be crushed out, then, as a matter of *self defence*, those so believing, whenever they get into power, will wield all that power to crush out and trample under foot the slave States of this Union, and to emancipate their slaves. This is the doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict," so loudly defended and advocated by Lincoln, Seward, and the Black Republican party. Are the people of this country prepared for this? Men of the North, are you willing to engage in this crusade against your Southern brethren; to drench this land in all the horrors of civil war; to cut the throats of Southern men, "bone of your bone and flesh of your flesh?" If yea, vote for Abraham Lincoln!

THE DISREGARD OF THE BLACK REPUBLICAN PARTY FOR LAW! THEY SPIT UPON THE CONSTITUTION AND THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES!

It has been well and truly said that "the law is the concentrated majesty of the voice of the people." He who violates a law, therefore, not only insults, but commits an offence

against the people. In this Government, especially, are we called upon to yield obedience to the laws. In no other way can the Republic exist. We have a written Constitution which our fathers made and which we must observe, if we expect to preserve our liberty, our independence, and our Union. That Constitution says:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

Under this provision, the Congress of 1793 passed, and Gen. Washington approved, a bill for the rendition of fugitive slaves. In 1850, Congress amended this bill in some slight particulars, not altering its main features, or violating the principle of the Act of 1793. The man who refuses to yield obedience to the Constitution and this law, as well as other laws made under its authority, *is an enemy to his country.*

The Constitution also established the Supreme Court as the court of last resort, to interpret the laws of the land, and makes its decision obligatory upon every citizen. He who, therefore, refuses to obey its decisions, *is an enemy to his country.* This matter cannot be dodged or evaded. Inculcate in the minds of the people a disrespect and contempt for the laws and decisions of the courts, and our Government is destroyed, and might take the place of right. Strike down the bulwarks of the laws and the courts, and where is the security for life and property? By what title, then, would the farmer hold his land, the mechanic his tools, the merchant his goods? By that title only which the mountain robber of Scotland proclaimed, when he said that while one shock of grain remained, or cattle grazed on low-land plain, the Gaul, to mountain and heather heir, with **STRONG ARM** *will take his share.*

How important it is to every citizen that the Constitution and the laws of the country should be observed and obeyed. The infraction of one law leads inevitably to the infraction of another. If one man is allowed to violate one law on the ground that it conflicts with his ideas of duty under a "higher law," another man will violate another law on the same pretext, until no law will be observed, and all the barriers which Government has erected for the preservation of the lives and property of its citizens will have been broken down, and the law of force will then be inaugurated. Is it not clear, then, that the man who refuses obedience to the Constitution and laws of his country *is an enemy to the Republic?* Judged by this standard, where stands the Republican party to-day?

We answer, their candidate for the presidency not only refuses to yield obedience to the decision of the Supreme Court, but actually declares his intention to disregard that decision! In his Chicago speech, July 10, 1858, he said:

"If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, *in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should.*"

Having thus set the example of disobedience to the Supreme Court, it is not strange that his supporters should run off in the same channel. Foremost of them we find Mr. Sumner thus advising resistance to the fugitive-slave law in a speech in Boston, in 1850:

"The good citizen, as he reads the requirements of this act (relative to fugitive slaves), is filled with horror. * * * * *

Here the path of duty is clear. I AM BOUND TO DISOBEY THIS ACT." * * * * *

"Sir, I will not dishonor this home of the Pilgrims, and of the Revolution by admitting—nay, I cannot believe—that *this bill will be executed here.*"

Again, in the Senate of the United States, we see him again reiterating his determination not to obey the law. Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, asked, "If we repeal the fugitive-slave law, will Massachusetts execute the provision of the Constitution without any law of Congress? Will this honorable senator [Mr. Sumner] tell me that he will do it?" To which Mr. Sumner replied: "*Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?*" Mr. Butler continued: "Then you would not obey the Constitution. Sir, standing here before this tribunal, where you swore to support it, you rise and tell me that you regard it the office of a dog to enforce it. Yo stand in my presence as a co-equal senator, and tell me that it is a dog's office to execute the Constitution of the United States?" To which Mr. Sumner said: "*I recognize no such obligation.*"

The Hon. Edward Wade, of Ohio, in his speech in the House, August 2, 1856, said:

"Thus, sir, the thrice execrable fugitive slave law, with its catch-pole bevy of slave-hunting commissioners and deputy marshals, *becomes a nullity and nuisance—the villianous concoction of slave-holding usurpation and dough-faced subserviency—and dissolves like stubble before the devouring fire.*"

The Hon. Sidney Dean, of Ohio, in his speech in the House, July 23, 1856, spoke in the same strain :

"The fugitive slave law is dead. It needs must die, sir; the Christian men in the model Republic will not be bloodhounds to catch men. * * * I tell gentlemen, in the honest convictions of my heart, that my constituents, neither in thought, word, nor deed, will ever acquiesce in thus branding our national character with infamy, and will never, for themselves, be made the political or personal slaves of such a monstrosity in Republicanism."

On the 11th of March, 1850, Senator Seward, of New York, thus spoke in the Senate :

"All that is just and sound; but assuming the same premises—to wit: that all men are equal by the law of nature and of nations—the *right of property in slaves falls to the ground*: for one who is equal to the other cannot be the owner or property of that other. But you answer that the Constitution recognizes property in slaves. It would be sufficient then, to reply, *that this Constitutional obligation MUST BE VOID, because it is repugnant to the law of nature and nations.*"

Again, in his speech at Albany, New York, October 12, 1855, Mr. Seward said :

"It is written in the Constitution of the United States, *in violation of the divine law*, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave. You blush not at these things because they are familiar as household words."

Still again, in his speech in the Senate, March 3, 1858, Mr. Seward thus assailed the Dred Scott decision and the Supreme Court :

"The Supreme Court also can reverse its spurious judgment more easily than we can reconcile the people to its usurpation." * * * "The people of the United States never can, *and they never will*, accept principles so unconstitutional and so abhorrent. Never, never. *Let the court recede.* Whether it recedes or not, WE SHALL REORGANIZE THE COURT, AND THUS REFORM ITS POLITICAL SENTIMENTS AND PRACTICES, and bring them into harmony with the Constitution and THE LAWS OF NATURE."

To the same effect is the address of the Republican State Convention of New York, in October, 1857 :

"It is one of the most lamentable features of the present Democratic degeneracy, that it has invaded even the sanctuary of justice, and from the seat once honored by Jay, Rutledge, Ellsworth, and Marshall, *now strains its equity through the sieve of sectionalism*, in accents as barbarous as they are disgraceful to the nation to which we belong and the age in which we live. The infamy of the Dred Scott decision is but a legitimate sequence to the efforts that have been put forth to sectionalize and pack a tribunal in which was once centred the respect and confidence of the nation."

Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, seems to have been a pioneer in the cause of assailing the Supreme Court. It will be remembered that in 1855, in the city of Philadelphia, a band of abolitionists, with Passmore Williamson at their head, rescued a fugitive slave from the custody of the officers of the law. For this he was tried, condemned, and imprisoned. Referring to this matter in his speech in New York, October, 1855, Mr. Wilson said :

"We shall change the Supreme Court of the United States, and place men in that court who believe with its pure and immaculate Chief Justice, John Jay, *that our prayers will be impious to Heaven while we sustain and support human slavery.* We shall free the Supreme Court of the United States from Judge Kane. And here let me say, there is a public sentiment growing up in this country that regards Passmore Williamson in his prison, at Philadelphia, as a martyr to the holy cause of personal liberty. There is a public sentiment springing up that will brand upon the brow of Judge Kane a mark that will make him exclaim, as his namesake, the elder Cain, 'It is too great for me to bear.'"

In 1850, Joshua R. Giddings addressed a letter to a meeting at Palmyra, Ohio, in which, speaking of the fugitive-slave law, he said :

"Yet we are told, we must obey this law and perpetuate these crimes until a slave-ridden Congress shall see fit to reclaim us from such sin against God by repealing the law. *Whether it be right to obey God rather than man, judge ye.*

"From my inmost soul I abhor, detest, and repudiate this law. I despise the human being who would obey it, if such a being has existence."

During the 1st session of the 34th Congress we find Mr. Giddings regaling the House with his law-defying doctrines, and bragging of his nigger-stealing propensities. He said :

"Gentlemen will bear with me when I assure them and the President, *that I have seen as many as nine fugitive slaves dining at one time in my house.* I fed them. I clothed them, and gave them money for their journey, *and sent them on their way rejoicing.* If that be treason make the most of it."

"Mr. BENNET, of Mississippi. I want to know if the gentleman would not have gone one step further?"

"Mr. GIDDINGS. Yes, sir. I would have gone one step further. I would have driven the slave

catcher who dared pursue them from my premises. I would have *kicked him from my door-yard* if he had made his appearance there; or had he attempted to enter my dwelling, I WOULD HAVE STRICKEN HIM DOWN *upon the threshold of my door!*"

The Hon. C. B. Sedgwick, of New York, in his speech in the House, March 26, 1860, said:

"Great ingenuity was exerted to make the fugitive slave bill as bad and as villainous as possible. *Men who would acquiesce in it might be relied upon to buy and sell—nay, they would sell the issue of their own loins, or send their mothers into the cotton field, for gold.* No law can be found upon the statute books of any civilized nation, having so many cruel and disgraceful features as this. It must have been expected that so infamous a law *would have been created by underground railroads, and all other honorable methods.* * * * *I am not, sir, a believer in the doctrine that a bad, infamous, and unconstitutional enactment—I cannot call it law—should be obeyed until it is repealed.* * * Where the question of personal and civil rights and liberty is involved, or the rights of conscience are thus invaded, *it is the duty of the citizen to resist.*"

The Hon. Daniel W. Gooch, of Massachusetts, in his speech in the House, May 3, 1860, denounced the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States:

"I regard that opinion, sir, as one of the most direct and positive falsifications of the well-known facts of history to be found in the English language, and *the greatest libel upon the men who framed the institutions under which we live ever published to the world.*"

The Hon. Josiah Quincy, of Boston, we see, has been writing a letter of approval to Mr. Sumner, of his speech in the Senate. In a speech delivered by him in Boston, August 18, 1854, he said:

"The obligation incumbent upon the free States to deliver up fugitive slaves is that burden; and it *must be obliterated from the Constitution at every hazard.*"

Now hear the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher:

"If there were as many laws as there are lines in the fugitive slave law, and as many officers as there were lions in Daniel's lion's den, *I would disregard every law but God's, and help the fugitive.* The officers might catch me, but not *him*, if I could help it."

We ask every honest man in this broad land, can any government exist where the people are taught to disregard and resist the Constitution and the laws? Does not such a state of things inevitably lead to anarchy and the overthrow of Government? By what right do you hold your lands, your houses, and your property of every description? By what right do you collect your debts? By law and the decisions of your courts. But the laws and the courts not only guarantee your rights of property, but they throw around your *lives* theegis of their protection. Sweep away all constitutions, all laws, all courts, and where is the protection of life and property? Then the law of force prevails—then confusion reigns—then anarchy is supreme—then the strong and sinewy arm and the brawny shoulders decide the rights of property and of life—then ruffian violence tears asunder *the bands of matrimony*, and gloats in its beastial free-love! Do you prefer this state of affairs to the Government you now have? If yea, then vote for the men who scoff at constitutions, resist laws, and defy the courts of the country—vote for Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin.

LINCOLN AND HIS SUPPORTERS IN FAVOR OF THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY AND THE HIGHER LAW!

In his tenth of July speech, in Chicago (see Debates, page 15), Mr. Lincoln in reply to some strictures on his Springfield speech, said:

"I did not even say that I desired that slavery should be put in course of ultimate extinction. I DO SAY SO NOW, HOWEVER; so there need be no longer any difficulty about that. It may be written down in the great speech."

"*I have always hated slavery, I think, as much as any abolitionist—I have been an old line Whig—I have always hated it; but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska bill began. I always believed that everybody was AGAINST it, and that it WAS AN COURSE OF ULTIMATE EXTINCTION.*"

Mr. Seward, in his great speech at Cleveland, Ohio, in the canvass of 1848, used the following explicit and unmistakable language:

"Slavery can be limited to its present bounds; it can be ameliorated. IT CAN BE, AND IT MUST BE ABOLISHED, and you and I can and must do it. The task is as simple and easy as its consummation will be beneficent, and its rewards glorious. It only requires to follow this simple rule of action: to do everywhere and at every occasion what we can, and not to neglect or refuse to do what we can, at any time, because at that precise time, and on that particular occasion, we cannot do more

Circumstances determine possibilities." * * * "Extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and **DEPEND** HIM as you would your paternal gods." "Correct your own error that slavery *has* any **CONSTITUTIONAL** guarantees which may not be **RELEASED**, and ought not to be relinquished." * * * "You will soon bring the parties of the country into an *effective aggression upon slavery.*"

In his speech in the Senate, March 11, 1850, Mr. Seward said:

"There are constitutions and statutes, codes mercantile and codes civil: but when we are legislating for States, especially when we are founding States, *all these laws must be brought to the standard of the laws of God, and must be tried by that standard, and MUST STAND OR FALL BY IT.*" *

"The Constitution regulates our stewardship; the Constitution devotes the domain to Union, to justice, to defence, to welfare, and to liberty. But there is a **HIGHER LAW** than the Constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain, and devotes it to the same noble purposes."—App. to Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 31st Cong., pages 263, 265.

Again, in a speech in the Senate, March, 1858, Mr. Seward said:

"*The interests of the white race demand the ULTIMATE EMANCIPATION of all men.* Whether that consummation shall be allowed to take effect, with needful and wise precautions against sudden change and disaster, *or be hurried on by VIOLENCE,* is all that remains for you to decide."

Still later, only a few days ago, at Boston, he boldly proclaimed:

"What a commentary upon the history of man is the fact that eighteen years after the death of John Quincy Adams *the people have for their standard-bearer Abraham Lincoln, confessing the obligations of the HIGHER LAW* which the Sage of Quincy proclaimed, and *contending for weal or woe, FOR LIFE OR DEATH, in the IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT BETWEEN FREEDOM AND SLAVERY. I desire only to say that we are in the LAST STAGE of the conflict before the great triumphal inauguration of this policy v.to the Government of the United States.*"

Gov. Chase, of Ohio, in the speech delivered in Cincinnati, from which we have already quoted, said:

"For myself, I am ready to renew my pledge, and I will venture to speak in behalf of my co-workers, that we will go straight on, without faltering or wavering, *until every vestige of oppression shall be erased from the statute-books*—until the sun, in all his journey from the utmost eastern horizon through the mid-heaven, till he sinks behind the western bed, shall NOT BEHOLD THE FOOT PRINT OF A SINGLE SLAVE in all our broad and glorious land."

Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, in his Boston speech in 1855, said:

"Send it abroad on the wings of the wind that I am committed, fully committed, committed to the fullest extent, in favor of *immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery*, wherever it exists under the authority of the Constitution of the United States."

In a letter written on July 20, 1855, the same Wilson wrote:

"Let us remember that more than three millions of bondsmen groaning under nameless woes, demand that we shall reprove each other, and that *we labor for THEIR DELIVERANCE.*" * *

"I tell you here to-night that the agitation of this question will continue while the FOOT OF A SLAVE PASSES THE SOIL OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC."

Now hear the Hon. Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives, on the 5th of April, 1860:

"You must sacrifice slavery for the good of your country. Refuse to proclaim **LIBERTY THROUGH ALL THE LAND**, to all the inhabitants thereof, and the exodus of the slave will be through the Red Sea. The country cannot afford to continue a practice fraught with so much of peril. It is better to remove the magazine than to be kept ever more in dread of a *lighted match.* The future glory and usefulness of this nation cannot be sacrificed to this system of crime. **SLAVERY MUST DIE.** *Carthago est delenda.*"

Horace Greeley, while admitting that the abolition of slavery in the States is the real object of the Republican party, explains the reason why they do not now openly advocate the doctrine. We quote from his paper (the *Tribune*) of July 25th, 1854:

"We contend that the abolition of slavery in the States is the *real object of the Republican party.* "Admit that abolition in the States is what all men *ought to strive for*, and it is clear to our mind that a large majority are not prepared for this, and the practical question is this; shall we politically attempt what will *certainly involve us in defeat and failure?* or shall we not rather attempt that which a majority ARE ripe for, and thus, by our consequent triumph, **INVITE THAT MAJORITY TO GO FURTHER?** Shall we insist on having all the possible eggs now, or be content to await their appearance day by day? The latter seems to us the only rational, sensible course. We care not how FAST Messrs. Birney & Co. may ripen public sentiment in the North **FOR EMANCIPATION**, WE WILL ADD THEM to the best of our ability; but we will not refuse the good *now* within our reach out of deference to that which is as yet *unattainable.* Mr. Birney's 'ultimatum' may be just what he sees fit; *we have not proposed to modify or meddle with it.* We only ask that he shall not interdict or prevent the doing of SOME good at once, merely because he would like to do MORE good, as **WE SHALL, ALSO, WHENEVER IT SHALL HAVE BECOME PRACTICABLE.**"

Determined, however, to let it be known and fully understood that the Black Republican party were striving for universal emancipation, Mr. Greeley, in his letter to ex-Governor Hunt,

dated July 30, 1860, reiterates the fact that republicanism means interference with slavery in the States:

"You ask me if guarantee would induce me to abandon my 'system of slavery agitation?' Your phraseology is vague; but my answer shall be frank and full. Believing slavery to be a flagrant violation of the inalienable rights of man, a burning reproach to our country, an enemy to her prosperity and progress in art, intelligence, and civilization, *I mean to labor for its eradication from our own and all other countries so long as I live.*"

The next gentleman we introduce is the Hon. Thomas H. Ford, ex-Lieutenant Governor of Ohio, and elected during the present Congress Public Printer, by the vote of every Black Republican member of the House. Mr. Ford made a speech before the Black Republican State Convention of Indiana in 1856, from which we quote:

"Slavery was the crying sin of this nation; *it must be got rid of.* He feared he was talking too plain to suit this State; he feared he might trammel the candidates of this convention; that he might utter sentiments upon this slavery question which might be *too strong* for the Republican party of Indiana. [Cries of 'No, you will not!' 'Go on!' 'You are right!' &c.] The compromises with slavery were hateful—they were accursed; we should make no compromises with such a *moral leprosy*. *The war on slavery was a war between righteousness and unrighteousness.* The people of the North should say to the people of the South, Let us alone, and we will regulate slavery for you; **WE WILL RULE IT OUT OF THE NATION.** Slavery was the question. It had to be met. He was willing to meet it. He was eternally and uncompromisingly opposed to slavery. **IT MUST BE BLOCKADED AND CRUSHED OUT.**"

Another gentleman from Ohio, the Hon. Wm. R. Sapp, in a speech in the House of Representatives, was also very enthusiastic that slavery should be put down:

"Mr. Chairman, the issue between the great political parties of the day is slavery and freedom. * * With Freedom, and Freemont, and Dayton emblazoned on the ample folds of our national banner, we will *drive* the base minions of slavery from their control of the Government, and we will use its power to build up our country, *free from the taints of slavery*, and make America worthy of being the north star of freedom. *Let the giant heel of freedom be placed upon the neck of the serpent of slavery.*"—Appendix, 1st Sess., 34th Cong., page 1000.

Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, in his speech in the Senate on the 19th and 20th of May, 1856, said:

"In offering herself (Kansas) for admission into the Union as a free State, she presents a *single issue for the people to decide.* And since the slave power now stakes on this issue all its ill-gotten supremacy, the people, while vindicating Kansas, will at the same time **OVERTHROW THIS TYRANNY.** Thus does the contest which she now begins involve not only liberty for herself, **BUT FOR THE WHOLE COUNTRY.**"

The Hon. John A. Andrews is now the Black Republican candidate for governor of Massachusetts. We quote from a speech of his made a few days ago in Boston:

"*Slavery will die out*, because the day shall surely be when there will be one whole family of man upon a sanctified earth as there will be in Heaven. *But I do not intend to wait for the Providence of God to work it out.*"

We close this branch of our subject as we commenced it, by calling Mr. Lincoln again on the stand. "Acts," it is said, "speak louder than words," and are the best index to a man's intentions and views. We will try Mr. Lincoln by this standard. Mr. Lincoln was a member of the Illinois legislature in 1837. On the 12th of January of that year the special committee of the legislature, to whom had been referred the "memorials of the general assemblies of the States of Virginia, Alabama, Mississippi, New York, and Connecticut relative to the existence of domestic slavery" and the works of abolitionists, &c., reported the following resolutions:

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we highly disapprove of the formation of abolition societies, and of the doctrines promulgated by them.

"*Resolved, That the right of property in slaves is sacred to the slaveholding States by the Federal Constitution, and that they cannot be deprived of that right without their consent.*

"*Resolved, That the General Government cannot abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, against the consent of the citizens of said District, without a manifest breach of good faith.*"

On the 20th of January, 1837, a vote was taken on these resolutions, and they were adopted. The vote on each resolution stood—ayes 77, nays 6. *Mr. Lincoln voted against each and every one of the resolutions*, thus approving of the doctrines and course of the abolitionists; thus committing himself to the doctrine that the South can be deprived of their slave property without their consent; and thus indorsing the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

Is not the evidence clear and conclusive, that the purpose of the Republican party is the

abolition of slavery in the States? And to what does this lead? *To a dissolution of the American Union.* Hence, we are not surprised to see the leaders of that party advocating a disruption of the Union.

Abolition of slavery! Men of the North, have you comprehended it? Have you thought of three million negroes, of degraded, debased negroes, thrown upon *you*? Have you thought of the excesses of this mass of negroes, wild with their freedom, uneducated, unrestrained by any moral perceptions and ideas, led by their passions alone, lazy, vicious, and uncontrollable? Have you thought of the horrors which this exodus from the South would entail upon you—of this mass of negroes perambulating your country, stealing and murdering as they go, until a war of races sweep them from the face of the American continent? If you have, and prefer such a state of affairs, to their being enslaved at the South, vote for the men who stand pledged to abolish slavery—vote for Abraham Lincoln.

THE BLACK REPUBLICAN PARTY INCITING THE SLAVES OF THE SOUTH TO INSURRECTION,
AND JUSTIFYING THE MASSACRE OF THE WHITES IN THE SOUTHERN STATES!

The foremost man in this work of inciting the slaves to insurrection, is Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio. He has been at it for years, as his speeches show. We will only go back to 1848. On the 25th of April, in that year, he delivered a speech in Congress, from which we quote:—

"The gentleman, however, says that abolitionists look to the insurrection of the slaves. Sir, who does not look to that INEVITABLE RESULT, unless the slave States remove the heavy burdens which now rest upon the down trodden and degraded people whom they oppress. *And why should we not expect it?* * * Sir, no lover of justice, no unbiassed mind, COULD BLAME THEM, for asserting and maintaining their inalienable rights."

We next quote from a speech, which will be found in the book of his speeches, which Mr. Giddings has published, pages 159, 160:—

"I would not be understood as desiring a servile insurrection; but I say to Southern gentlemen, that there are hundreds of thousands of honest and patriotic men, *who will laugh at your calamity, and will mock when your fear cometh.* IF BLOOD AND MASSACRE should mark the struggle for liberty of those who for ages have been oppressed and degraded, my prayer to the God of Heaven shall be, that justice, stern, unyielding justice may be awarded to both master and slave. I desire that every human being may enjoy the rights with which the God of nature has endowed him. If those rights can be regained by the down-trodden sons of Africa in our Southern States, by quiet and peaceful means, I hope they will pursue such peaceful measures. But if they cannot regain their God-given rights by peaceful means, *I nevertheless hope they will regain them; and if blood be shed, I should certainly hope that it might be the blood of those who stand between them and freedom,* and not the blood of those who have long been robbed of their wives and children, and all they hold dear in life."

On the 16th of May, 1854, we find Mr. Giddings delivering another speech in the House, in which he gives this advice to his Black Republican friends, who go to the Territories:—

"Tell the slave who comes there his rights; teach him his obligations to himself; PUT ARMS IN HIS HANDS; *instruct him in their use, and the best mode of protecting himself.* Were I a resident of a Territory, and slaves were held in bondage around me, I WOULD SUPPLY THEM WITH ARMS, and teach them to use all the means which God and nature has placed within their control, to maintain their freedom and their manhood."

Now for another gem from Giddings. In 1858, a band of Abolitionists, with force and arms, rescued some fugitive slaves from the custody of the Marshal and his escort, for which they were imprisoned. Giddings approved the act of the Abolitionists, but thought they ought to have killed the officers of the law! We quote from his speech at Oberlin, Ohio:—

"In disregarding the law, the prisoners did right. Their error consisted in SPARING THE LIVES of the slave-catchers. *Those pirates should have been delivered over to the colored men, and consigned to the doom of pirates.* You are aware that this is the doctrine which I proclaimed in Congress. I adhere to it. Had the prisoners EXECUTED THE SLAVE-CATCHERS PROMPTLY, it would have taught the Administration a lesson not soon to be forgotten. We should have been no more troubled with that class of miscreants. They would have learned better than to show themselves among an intelligent people who know their rights, and dare maintain them."

Now, let us listen to a defence of old John Brown, by Mr. Lovejoy, of Illinois, in his speech of April 5th, 1860:—

"This affair of John Brown, brings us to the reality of things. This raid confronts us with slavery, and makes us ask, is slaveholding right? and if so, what right has it? * * In regard to John Brown, you want me to curse him. I will not curse John Brown. You want me to pour out execrations upon the head of old Osawatimie. Though all the slaveholding Balaks in the country fill their houses with silver, and proffer it, I will not curse John Brown. * * I BELIEVE THAT HIS PURPOSE WAS A GOOD ONE; that so far as own motives before God were concerned *they were*

honest and truthful; and no one can deny that he stands head and shoulders above any other character that appeared on the stage in that tragedy, from beginning to end, from the time he entered the armory there, to the time when he was strangled by Gov. Fussation. HE WAS NOT GUILTY OF MURDER OR TREASON. Despotism has seldom sacrificed three nobler victims than Brown, Stevens, and Hazlett. If the blood of innocent men is thus taken by an absolute, unqualified, unjustifiable violation of natural law, what will it appease, what will it pacify? It will mingle with the earth; it will mix with the waters of the ocean; the whole civilized world will snuff it in the air; and it will return with AWFUL RETRIBUTION on the heads of those violators of natural law, and universal justice."

This infamous fanatic not only justifies John Brown, but is for visiting "*retribution*" upon the South, because they hung the murderer of their citizens.

On the 2d of December, 1859, the day on which John Brown expiated his guilt upon the gallows, in Charlestown, Virginia, the Melodeon Hall, in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, was draped in mourning, and a meeting there assembled to mourn over his fate. Albert G. Riddle was the president of the meeting, and made a speech, which we find reported in the *Morning Leader*, the Black Republican paper published in that city, from which we quote:—

"A. G. Riddle, Esq., remarked that there never was a time in which stirring and unexpected events brought us by such unexpected short cuts to important conclusions as now. There is no political commotion abroad, *but what we see and hear is the red glare that leaps from the mouth of the cannon, and the voices of the storm that shall sweep and shake the world.* John Brown is dead, but what of that? Why is it that you gather together here, and all over the land the very bells have vibrated with the significance of the hour? Do we venerate a traitor? *Not at all, but because slavery has seized the old man, John Brown, in the gaze of two hemispheres, as a victim on whom to wreak their vengeance.* It matters not to us that all this is done under the forms of law. What of that? *So ages ago, the charge was made against the Saviour of the world, and a 'strong case,' as the lawyers would say, was found, and he was pronounced guilty and put to death.* What revelations this little blow of John Brown has made, showing, as it does, the helplessness and weakness of slavery! It lies now helpless, and the whole world is looking in upon its nakedness. It has revealed, too, the cowardice which slavery makes of otherwise brave men. *Of all the spectacles of fear, was there ever any parallel to the terror with which this blow of John Brown has enveloped the chivalry of the South?* Again, it has developed the cruelty which this system fosters and encourages.

"But this event has also developed and exhibited the nobleness and greatness of Brown and his associates. *The liveliest imagination fails to show us the fulness of the lesson which has been taught on the scaffold, as the pearly gates opened and AS PURE A SOUL entered as has passed into the hereafter in the last thousand years.*"

That man, Albert G. Riddle, is now the Black Republican candidate for Congress in the banner Black-Republican (Western Reserve) district in Ohio!

At this meeting resolutions were unanimously passed, which were reported from a committee composed of Judge R. P. Spaulding, a member of the Chicago Convention which nominated Lincoln, Judge D. R. Tilden, one of the leading Black Republicans in Ohio, and Rev. Mr. Brewster, a political parson of the same stripe. We give them as follows:—

"WHEREAS, The 'peculiar institution' has this day made strikingly manifest its baneful influence upon the 'rights of man,' by inflicting the death penalty, at Charlestown, Virginia, upon John Brown, of Ossawatimie, *for a conscientious observance of the law of brotherhood as inculcated by Jesus Christ, and the law of freedom as taught by Thomas Jefferson:—*

"Resolved, That the system of negro slavery, as it now exists in some of the States of the American Confederacy, is but the '*experiment of despotism,*' which lives upon conceptions, and becomes lusty upon conciliations and compromises. It is, in the words of Wesley, '*the sum of all villainies,*' and can only be subdued by giving it, in Southern parlance, 'WAR TO THE KNIFE, WITH THE KNIFE TO THE HILT.'

"Resolved, That the State of Virginia, under the lead of Henry A. Wise, is a contemptible caricature of the 'Old Dominion' in the days of George Washington and George Mason. She was once aptly called 'the Mother of Presidents.' She may now, with significant propriety, be termed 'the Mother of Slaves.' She is afflicted with frightful visions of armed invaders, and with a luxuriantly guilty conscience; her chivalry flee when pursued by shadows. They are ready to cry out with the 'Humphback'—

'By the Apostle Paul! shadows to-night
'Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard
'Than could the substance of ten thousand soldiers
'Armed in proof.'

"Resolved, That for their conduct in the Harper's Ferry war, when 'one man chased a thousand,' and in the sequel to that war, when 'ten thousand' put the one man to death, the spurs should be hacked from the heels of the chivalry of Virginia, the bearings on their State shield reversed, and, instead of the prostrate despot with his broken manacles, and the spirit-stirring motto, '*Sic Semper Tyrannus,*' their heraldic devices should be fetters, and handcuffs, and bowstrings, with a 'Son of Liberty' on a gibbet, bearing the significant inscription—'*Degeneres Animos Timor Arquit.*'

"Resolved, That it was in exact keeping with the character and conduct of the citizens of South Carolina, who had furnished a bully to beat down freedom's champion in the Senate Chamber, to

furnish a halter to hang *freedom's champion at Harper's Ferry*. The people of the North have 'food for reflection.'

"Resolved, That we fully agree in sentiment with those fathers of the Republic who, before the adoption of the Constitution, and while that instrument was undergoing examination, patriotically exclaimed 'however desirable a union of these States may be, the preservation of our liberties is still more desirable.' We have, by force of circumstances, become convinced that the '*irrepressible conflict*' is upon us, and that it will never terminate until '*freedom or slavery go to the wall*.' In such a contest, and under such a dire necessity, we say, 'without fear and without reproach,' LET FREEDOM STAND THOUGH THE UNION BE DISSOLVED!

"We further say, that any religion that sanctions or apologizes for a government that authorizes human slavery, and legalizes murder, is barbarous in spirit, evil in tendency, and in virtual fellowship with the 'sum of all villainies!'

"Resolved, That John Brown, who in his life was a thorn in the side of the oppressor, has in his death become to the slave power 'more terrible than an army with banners.' His eulogy is best spoken by his executioner—he possesses the greatest integrity, truthfulness, and courage, that I ever met!"

"Resolved, That however much we may lament the death of the devoted Brown, we are satisfied that his execution will bring confusion upon his enemies, and do more to overthrow the bulwarks of slavery than a long life of philanthropic deeds with a peaceful exit. *We honor his memory!* Posterity will give him a monument as indestructible as their aspirations for FREEDOM."

Judge Tilden made a speech in support of the resolutions, from which we quote the following:—

"Amid the feelings I felt on the death of my old and valued friend I am almost unable to express myself as I otherwise would. I could not fail, however, to express to this meeting my respect, my ADMIRATION, my VENERATION for the old man that Virginia has this day executed on the gallows. John Brown has gone to his grave, and we can't call him back, but I propose that *we baptize ourselves in his spirit*, and stand upon a foundation of adamant in *unalterable hostility to slavery*. [Cries of 'Good, good,'] By his execution, *slavery has driven the first nail in its own coffin*. And it seems that there is a special Providence in Brown's suffering at this time, as did Luther, Cromwell, and Russell, and all of them, except Luther, have died upon the scaffold, but their works live after them, and so will John Brown's.

The Rev. Mr. Brewster said:—

"We are not here to advocate an armed invasion of the South. *The time has not come for that*—HOW SOON IT WILL, we are not prepared to say! We are not here to sympathize with or for Brown, for he has gone; and before his death, thank God, he didn't need it. I can only say, as I sit down, '*John Brown*,' one of the immortal names that will never die."

Judge Spaulding also made a short speech, from which we extract the following:—

"I claim John Brown as a hero, true to his conscience and true to his God. We have met to honor him for his faithfulness to his convictions of duty, and his principles. *We have met to honor those principles, and the cause in which he died*. Governor Wise was a thousand times more entitled to the term of felon than old John Brown."

Now, listen to Horace Greeley in the *Tribune* of the 9th December, 1859:—

"Unwise the world will pronounce him—reckless of artificial yet palpable obligations he certainly was; but his very errors were heroic, the faults of a brave, impulsive, truthful nature, impatient of wrong, and only too conscious that *resistance to tyrants is obedience to God!* Let whoever would first cast a stone, ask himself *whether his own noblest act was equal in grandeur and nobility to that for which John Brown pays the penalty of a death on the gallows.*"

"To all who have suffered for human good, who have been persecuted for an idea, who have been hated because of their efforts to make the daily path of the despised and unfortunate less rugged, *his memory will be fragrant through generations*. It will be easier to die hereafter in a good cause, even on the gallows, since John Brown has HALLOWED THAT MODE OF EXIT from the troubles and temptations of this mortal life."

We next quote from the *Winsted* (Connecticut) *Herald*, a strong Republican paper, now flying at its masthead the names of Lincoln and Hamlin:—

"For one, we confess we love him, we honor him, we applaud him. He is honest in his principles, courageous in their defence, and we have yet to be taught, reading from the book of inspiration we acknowledge, *how and wherein old John Brown is a transgressor*."

"He dared to undertake what you (the Republican leaders), in the security of your sanctams, only are bold to preach."

A few days ago, the Republican party of Massachusetts met in State Convention, and nominated, by a vote of over two to one, John A. Andrews, of Boston, as their candidate for Governor. When we saw the nomination, we thought we had heard of the gentleman before, and sure enough we had. On looking over the November files of the Boston papers, we find that *this same John A. Andrews presided at a John Brown sympathy meeting on the 19th November, 1859, at which Wendell Phillips and R. W. Emerson made speeches*. He, too, made a speech, and from it we make the following extract:—

"John Brown and his companions in the conflict at Harper's Ferry, those who fell there and

those who are to suffer upon the scaffold, are victims and *martyrs* to an idea. *There is an irrepressible conflict* [great applause] between freedom and slavery as old and as immortal as the irrepressible conflict between right and wrong. *They are among the martyrs of that conflict.* JOHN BROWN WAS RIGHT. I sympathize with the man, I sympathize with the idea *because I sympathize with and believe in the ETERNAL RIGHT.* They who are dependent upon him and his sons and his associates, in the battle at Harper's Ferry, *have a right to call upon us who have professed to believe, or who have, in any manner or measure, TAUGHT THE DOCTRINE OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN AS APPLIED TO THE COLORED SLAVES OF THE SOUTH,* to stand by them in their bereavement. We are to-night in the presence of a great and an awful sorrow, which has fallen like a pall upon many families whose hearts fail, whose affections are lacerated, and whose hopes are crushed—all of hope left on earth destroyed by an event, which, under the providence of God, *I pray will be overruled for that GOOD which was contemplated and intended by John Brown.*

And this man is the Black Republican candidate for Governor of Massachusetts!

We ask, in all soberness and earnestly, is not the Republican party guilty of all the blood that has been shed in Kansas, at Harper's Ferry, and is now being shed in the insurrections in Texas? They have told the negroes from the forums of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that they were entitled to their freedom; that it was a gross usurpation and tyranny to hold them in bondage; that they were the equals of the white man; that the slaveholders were a band of thieves, robbers, and murderers; that there was an irrepressible conflict between the free North and the slave-holding South—that John Brown was right in murdering in cold blood the defenceless and unarmed inhabitants of Harper's Ferry. What but insurrection and bloodshed could spring from such counsels? Is it any wonder that, seduced by these words, and believing the men sincere who uttered them, John Brown and his deluded followers sought to decide that "irrepressible conflict" in favor of their own section?

The Republican party cannot wash its hands of this bloody transaction. Look at their defence of John Brown. Look at their deifying a man, who, without provocation, at the dead of night, stole down upon the peaceful and unsuspecting inhabitants of a town, who had done him no wrong, inciting their slaves to cut their throats, and he and his followers imbruing their hands in their blood. And this horrible, infamous act received the approval and the applause of the leaders of the Republican party. Men of the North! are you prepared to indorse such conduct? If yea, vote for the men who instigated and defended it; vote for their candidate, Abraham Lincoln.

THE INFAMOUS ABUSE OF THE SOUTH BY THE BLACK REPUBLICANS.

One of the means employed by the Abolition Black Republican party to bring about a dissolution of the Union, and that Northern confederacy which they so much desire, is to abuse and goad the Southern men to madness by their vile and infamous abuse. They have been at this systematically for years, but recently they have far outstripped all former efforts of villification and slang. We extract a few choice specimens:—

And first on the list comes Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, who has left all other competitors in the work of vituperation and abuse far in the rear. From his infamous speech in the Senate, June 4, 1860, we quote:—

"Language is feeble to express all the enormity of this institution, which is now vaunted as in itself a form of civilization, ennobling at least, to the master if not the slave. Look at it in whatever light you will, and it is always *the scab—the canker, 'the bare bones,' and the shame of the country*; wrong, not merely in the abstract, as is often admitted by its apologists, but *wrong in the concrete also*, and possessing no single element of right. Look at it in the light of principle, and it is nothing less than a *huge insurrection against the eternal law of God*, and also the denial of that Divine law in which God himself is manifest, thus being practically *the grossest lie and the grossest atheism*. Barbarous in origin; barbarous in its law; barbarous in all its pretensions; barbarous in the instruments it employs; barbarous in consequences; barbarous in spirit; barbarous wherever it shows itself. *Slavery must breed barbarians, while it develops everywhere alike in the individual, and in the society of which he forms a part, the essential elements of barbarism.*

"Violence, brutality, injustice, barbarism, must be reproduced in the lives of all who live within their fatal sphere. The meat that is eaten by man enters into and becomes a part of his body; the madder which is eaten by a dog changes his bones to red; and the slavery on which men live in all its fivefold foulness, must become a part of themselves, discolored their very souls, blotting their characters, and breaking forth in moral leprosy. This language is strong; but the evidence is even stronger. Some there may be of happy natures, like honorable Senors, who can thus feed and not be harmed. Mithridates FED ON POISON, and lived; and it may be there is a moral Mithridates who can swallow without bane the poison of slavery."

In his speech in New York, delivered a few days ago, Mr. Sumner repeats the same villianous language. He declares that it is the mission of the Republican party to fight out the

battle between "civilization and barbarism, between freedom and slavery," and regrets that in this war he has only words to use when he "ought to command thunderbolts." Had he the powers of Omnipotence, he would crush at once by the thunders of his indignation that system which he describes as "offensive to civilization, hostile to law itself, by virtue of which it pretends to live, insulting to humanity, shocking to decency, and utterly heedless of all rights, forms, or observances, in the maintenance of its wicked power." And in his peroration, he bursts out into the following fiery appeal to those who have engaged in "the Holy War," against "the slave oligarchy":—

"Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and the door will be opened to all generous principles; prostrate the slave oligarchy, and liberty will become, in fact as in law, the normal condition of all the national Territories. Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and the National Government will be at length divorced from slavery, and the national policy will be changed from slavery to freedom. Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and the North will be admitted to its just share in the trusts and honors of the Republic! Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and a mighty victory of peace will be won, whose influence on the future of our country and of mankind no imagination can paint!

His prototype in the House of Representatives, the Hon. Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, in a speech delivered in that body on the 5th of April, 1860, thus poured out the sluices of his vituperative malice upon the South:—

"Slaveholding has been justly designated as the sum of all villiany. Put every crime perpetrated among men into a moral crucible, and dissolve and combine them all, *and the resultant amalgam is slaveholding.* It has the violence of robbery.

"A MEMBER. You are joking.

"MR. LOVEJOY. No, sir, I am speaking in dead earnest before God, God's own truth. *It has the violence of robbery, the blood and cruelty of piracy; it has the offensive and brutal lusts of polygamy, all combined and concentrated in itself, with aggravations that neither one of these crimes ever knew or dreamed of.*

"MR. CHAIRMAN, I was about stating, when interrupted, that the principle upon which slaveholding was sought to be justified in this country would, if carried out in the affairs of the universe, transform Jehovah, the Supreme, into an infinite Juggernaut, rolling the huge wheels of his omnipotence ankle-deep, amid the crushed, mangled, and bleeding bodies of human beings [laughter on the Democratic side], on the ground that he was infinitely superior, and that they were an inferior race."

In another speech delivered in the House on the 21st of April, 1859, Mr. Lovejoy said:—

"And it can be truly said of slavery, that there is nothing that it does not touch, and nothing that it touches that it does not defile. It has perverted the Government, violated the national faith, muzzled the press, *debauched the church, corrupted Christianity,* and seeks to change the glory of the invisible God into a Moloch, and transform the eternal and loving Father into a patron of cruelty, lust, and injustice. *I should be ashamed of such a God as that."*

Another member, the Hon. Charles H. Van Wyck, of New York, sought to run a tilt with Lovejoy in the work of defamation of the South. But the following extract from his speech of 7th March, 1860, shows that he could not come up to the mark:—

"You talk of God, justice, and mercy, who hold, claiming by Divine authority, four millions of human beings, in hopeless and irretrievable bondage, and ostracise free white men who will not sing hosannas to *your traffic in the bodies and souls of men,* and stigmatize as murderers and felons those who will not applaud the *cruelty which tramples upon all the attributes of the mind, the affections of the heart, given by the Almighty to the children of his own creation.*

"The leprosy of slavery is 'in the warp and woof' of your organization."

Take a short extract from the speech of Senator Wilson in New York, October 4, 1856:—

"In the other section, they found fifteen slave States. There they did not find the mechanic arts, save in a rude form; there they did not find commerce, nor philanthropic institutions; but they found three millions of slaves and SIX MILLIONS OF DEGRADED WHITE FREEMEN."

Is such language calculated to bind still closer the "sacred ties" that link us together as one people? Oh no, the object of the men who utter such libels upon the South is to "alleviate," to estrange, to embitter, and, finally, to separate one section of the country from the other. And yet they have the assurance to vaunt themselves as the followers of "the meek and lowly Jesus," and pompously parade their claim to religion and piety! We would commend to them the words of the inspired Apostle: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger and clamor, and evil-speaking, be put away from you, with all malice."

Is it any wonder that a state of alarm exists in the South at the prospect, however remote, of such a party getting into power in this country? Is it any wonder that, in view of these denunciations, the Southern people are excited and indignant? Is it any wonder that, seeing the spirit of deep malice and hatred evinced by the Black Republican leaders towards them, they should aim for self-preservation and self-defence? *This thing must have an end.* The Northern people must rise in their might, and rebuke this intolerant and diabolical spirit of Black Republicanism, or it will work the subversion of the Constitution and

the Union. Men of the North, our appeal is to you. You hold in your hands the destiny of this great country. Before God, we charge you that you acquit yourselves worthily, and prove yourselves fit to be intrusted with the high duties and the deep responsibilities your fathers committed to your keeping.

OTHER INFAMOUS SENTIMENTS OF THE BLACK REPUBLICAN LEADERS, REVOLUTIONARY IN THEIR CHARACTER, BLASPHEMOUS IN THEIR EXPRESSION, AND INSURRECTIONARY IN THEIR DESIGNS.

We head the list with Joshua R. Giddings, the father of the Black Republican party. The extract will be found in a speech delivered by him in the House of Representatives, on the 16th of March, 1854 :—

"When the contest shall come, when the thunder shall roll, and the lightning flash, when the slaves shall rise in the South, when, in imitation of the Cuban bondmen, the Southern slaves shall feel that they are men, when they feel the stirring emotions of immortality, and recognize the stirring truth that they are men, and entitled to the rights which God has bestowed upon them; when the slaves shall feel that, and when masters shall turn pale and tremble when their dwellings shall smoke, and dismay sit on every countenance, then, sir, I do not say, 'we will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh;' but I do say, when that time shall come, the lovers of our race will stand forth and exert the legitimate powers of this Government for freedom. We shall then have constitutional power to act for the good of our country, and do justice to the slave. Then will we strike off the shackles from the limbs of the slave. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that time hastens. It is rolling forward. I hail it as I do the approaching dawn of that political MILLENIUM which I am well assured will come upon the world."

Next comes Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, in that speech of his from which we have already quoted so much :—

"I tell you, Mr. Chairman, and I tell you all, that if I were a slave, and had I the power, and were it necessary to achieve my freedom, I would not hesitate to fill up and bridge over the chasm that yawns between the hell of slavery and the Heaven of freedom, with the carcasses of the slain. Give me my freedom. Hands off. Unthrottle that man. Give him his liberty. He is entitled to it from his God."

Now for the Hon. Anson Burlingame, of Massachusetts, who, in a speech in Boston, blasphemously exclaimed: *"The times demand, and we must have, AN ANTI-SLAVERY CONSTITUTION, AN ANTI-SLAVERY BIBLE, AND AN ANTI-SLAVERY GOD."*

But all these infamous expressions and sentiments, and even more, if it be possible, are centred in that sum total of all diabolical infamy, "Helper's Impending Crisis." We submit a few choice extracts :—

"Such are the agricultural achievements of slave labor; such are the results of 'the sum of all villainies.' The diabolical institution subsists on its own flesh. At one time children are sold to procure food for the parents; at another, parents are sold to procure food for the children. Within its pestilential atmosphere, nothing succeeds; progress and prosperity are unknown; inanition and slothfulness ensue; everything becomes dull, dismal, and unprofitable; wretchedness and desolation stand or lie in bold relief throughout the land; an aspect of most melancholy inactivity and dilapidation broods over every city and town; ignorance and prejudice sit enthroned over the minds of the people; usurping despots wield the sceptre of power; everywhere and in everything, between Delaware and the Gulf of Mexico, are the multitudinous evils of slavery apparent."

*"We enter our protest against it, and deem it our duty to use our most strenuous efforts to overturn and abolish it. * * * We are not only in favor of keeping slavery out of the territories, but, carrying our opposition to the institution a step farther, we here unhesitatingly declare in favor of its IMMEDIATE and UNCONDITIONAL ABOLITION IN EVERY STATE in the Confederacy where it now exists."—Page 25 of The Crisis.*

"The great revolutionary movement which was set on foot in Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, on the 20th day of May, 1775, has not yet been terminated, nor will it be until every slave the United States is freed from the tyranny of his master."—Page 95 of The Crisis.

"Slaveholders are a nuisance."

"It is our imperative business to abate nuisances."

"We believe that THIEVES are, as a general rule, less amenable to the moral law than SLAVEHOLDERS."

"SLAVEHOLDERS ARE MORE CRIMINAL THAN COMMON MURDERERS."

"Slaveholders and slave-traders are, as a general thing, unfit to occupy any honorable station in life."

"It is our honest conviction that all the pro-slavery slaveholders, who are alone responsible for the continuance of the baneful institution among us, deserve to be AT ONCE REDUCED TO A PARALLEL WITH THE BASEST CRIMINALS THAT LIE FETTERED WITHIN THE CELLS OF OUR PUBLIC PRISONS."

"Were it possible that the whole number (i. e., of the slaveholders) could be gathered together and transferred into four equal gangs of [] licensed ROBBERS, RUFFIANS, THIEVES, and MURDERERS, [] society, we feel assured, would suffer less from their atrocities than it does now."

"So it seems that the total number of actual slave-owners, including their entire crew of cringing Fekspittles, against whom we have to contend, is but three hundred and forty-seven thousand five hundred and twenty-five. Against this army for the defence and propagation of slavery, WE THINK IT WILL BE AN EASY MATTER—independent of the negroes, who, in nine cases out of ten, would be delighted with an opportunity to CUT THEIR MASTERS' THROATS, and without accepting a single recruit from either of the free States, England, France, or Germany—TO MUSTER ONE AT LEAST THREE TIMES AS LARGE, AND FAR MORE RESPECTABLE, FOR ITS UTTER EXTINCTION. We hope the matter in dispute may be adjusted without arraying these armies against each other in hostile attitude.

"But we are wedded to one purpose, from which no earthly power can ever divorce us. WE ARE DETERMINED TO ABOLISH SLAVERY AT ALL HAZARDS—IN DEFIANCE OF ALL OPPOSITION, OF WHATEVER NATURE, WHICH IT IS POSSIBLE FOR SLAVOCRATS TO BRING AGAINST US."—Page 149.

"At once let the good and true men of this country, the patriot sons of the patriot fathers, determine that the sun which rises to celebrate the centennial anniversary of our national independence shall not set on the head of any slave within the limits of this republic."—Page 278.

"Henceforth, sirs, we are demandants, not supplicants. We demand our rights—nothing more, nothing less. It is for you to decide whether we are to have justice peaceably or BY VIOLENCE; for, whatever consequences may follow, we are determined to have it, ONE WAY OR THE OTHER."

If this book had been put forth without any other indorsement save that of the author, we would have regarded it as the insane ravings of a madman, and would have given it no notice. But what was our surprise to find the book "*CORDIALLY endorsed*" by SIXTY-NINE Republican members of Congress, and the most energetic efforts made by the whole Republican leaders for its distribution! They state in their circular that they "have read and critically examined the work; that no other volume now before the public, as we conceive, is, *in all respects*, so well calculated to induce in the minds of its readers a decided and persistent repugnance to slavery;" that its "extensive circulation would, we believe, be productive of most *beneficial results*," and they hope their friends "will assist us in carrying out a plan we have devised for the *gratuitous* distribution of one hundred thousand copies." To this circular is appended the names of the following Black Republican members of the House of Representatives of the last (35th) Congress, to wit:—

INDIANA.—Schuyler Colfax, Charles Case, David Kilgore, James Wilcox.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Anson Burlingame, Calvin C. Chaffee, Daniel W. Gooch, Henry L. Dawes, Timothy Davis, C. L. Knapp, Robert B. Hall, James Buffington.

ILLINOIS.—Owen Lovejoy, William Kellogg, E. B. Washburne, J. F. Farnsworth.

NEW YORK.—Amos B. Granger, E. B. Morgan, Wm. H. Kelsey, George W. Palmer, S. G. Andrews, A. B. Olin, Emory B. Pottle, R. E. Fenton, A. S. Murray, John M. Parker, Charles B. Hoard, John Thompson, J. W. Sherman, O. B. Matteson, Francis E. Spinner, Silas M. Burroughs, Edward Dodd.

PENNSYLVANIA.—Galusha A. Grow, John Covode, William Stewart, S. A. Purviance.

OHIO.—Joshua R. Giddings, Edward Wade, John Sherman, J. A. Bingham, Benjamin Stanton, C. B. Tompkins, Philemon Bliss, V. B. Horton, Richard Mott.

MICHIGAN.—William A. Howard, Henry Waldron, De Witt C. Leach.

VERMONT.—Justin S. Morrill, H. E. Royce, E. P. Walton.

MAINE.—Israel Washburne, Jr., F. H. Morse, John M. Wood, Stephen C. Foster, Charles J. Gilman.

WISCONSIN.—Cad. C. Washburne, John F. Potter.

CONNECTICUT.—Sidney Dean.

RHODE ISLAND.—Nathaniel B. Durfee, William D. Brayton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—Mason W. Tappan, James Pike.

IOWA.—T. Davis, Samuel R. Curtis.

NEW JERSEY.—Isaiah D. Clawson, George R. Robbins.

MISSOURI.—Francis P. Blair.

In addition to this, we find another circular similar to the one above given, signed by Horace Greeley, editor of the Tribune, Thurlow Weed, editor of the Black Republican State organ in New York, James Kelley, chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of New York, William C. Bryant, editor of the New York Evening Post, B. S. Hedrick, John Jay, John A. Kennedy, and other leading Black Republicans in the State of New York.

We have thus shown that the Black Republican members of the last Congress indorsed the brutal and diabolical sentiments of this infamous work. What of the Black Republican members of the present (36th) Congress? We answer that, for two months they voted for, and labored to elect to the Speaker's chair, a man who had signed the circular indorsing and urging the circulation of this book. Thus, by their *acts*, did they too indorse the infamous doctrines it inculcated. But we have, also, other authority to fasten the charge upon them

—an authority which none of them dare gainsay—that of their patriarch, Joshua R. Giddings. He wrote the following letter to the editor of the Ashtabula (Ohio) Sentinel, when Mr. Sherman's name was withdrawn as the Republican candidate for Speaker:—

“WASHINGTON CITY, February 5, 1860.

“To the Editor of the Ashtabula Sentinel: Our friends at home should be slow to censure their representatives for deserting Mr. Sherman.” “*They felt the humiliation of discarding a candidate because he had indorsed the doctrines of Helper's book, EVERY SENTENCE OF WHICH FINDS A RESPONSE IN THE HEARTS OF ALL TRUE REPUBLICANS.*” . . .

“J. R. GIDDINGS.”

Thus out of their own mouths have we proven that the Republican party indorses and approves the infamous sentiments and the brutal and diabolical programme contained and set forth in this book. Its proclaimed and undisguised object is the abolition of slavery at the South by force, which is to be exercised by the Federal Government as soon as the Republican party shall obtain possession of it, while the Southern States are to be forced to manumit their slaves, or submit to a servile insurrection. Such is the bloody programme of the Black Republican leaders. Men of the North, are you prepared for this? If yea, vote for the men who signed, indorsed, and recommend it, whose candidate for the Presidency is Abraham Lincoln.

THE BLACK REPUBLICAN PARTY ADVOCATING DISUNION AND REVOLUTION!

The Black Republican party is most essentially the disunion party of this country. They advocate doctrines that must inevitably lead to a disruption of the confederacy. They are the legitimate offspring of that party that, from the foundation of this republic, have always been opposed to territorial expansion. Their doctrine was to confine the Government to the original thirteen States. Failing in this, they now seek, through the channel of slavery agitation, and violent abuse of the South, to bring about a dissolution of the Union, and that NORTHERN CONFEDERACY for which they have so long and so persistently labored. Their leaders seek this end by unconstitutional assaults upon the South, by violent abuse of Southern men, by a system of eternal agitation, by “blockading” slavery and “crushing” it out. Some of them, however, come out plainly and avow their object. We propose to give a few instances.

Governor Banks, of Massachusetts, who was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives in 1856, by the Black Republicans, in a speech, delivered in Maine, in the preceding year, said:—

“Although I am not one of that class of men who cry for the preservation of the Union; *though I am willing, in a certain state of circumstances, to LET IT SLIDE*, I have no fear for its perpetuation. But let me say, if the chief object of the people of this country be to maintain and propagate chattel property in man—in other words, human slavery—*this Union cannot and OUGHT NOT TO STAND.*”

Still later, in 1856, in a speech in Massachusetts, we find Mr. Banks turning prophet, and predicting a “military dictatorial government” in this country. He had no faith in the stability of “free institutions.” He said:—

“I can conceive of a time when this Constitution shall not be in existence; *when we shall have an absolute military dictatorial government*, transmitted from age to age, with men at its head who are made rulers by military commission, or who claim an hereditary right to govern those over whom they are placed.”

In a speech at a mass meeting in Maine, in 1855, the same at which Mr. Banks spoke, Senator Wade, of Ohio, gave utterance to the following treasonable sentiments:—

“There was *no freedom at the South for either white or black*; and he would strive to protect the free soil of the North from the same blighting curse. *There was really no UNION NOW BETWEEN THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH; and he believed no two nations upon the earth entertained feelings of MORE BITTER RANCOR towards each other than these two sections of the republic. The only salvation of the Union, therefore, was to be found in divesting it entirely from all taint of SLAVERY. THERE WAS NO UNION WITH THE SOUTH. Let us have a Union, OR LET US SWEEP AWAY THIS REMNANT WHICH WE CALL A UNION. I go for a Union where all men are equal, OR FOR NO UNION AT ALL, and I go for right.*”

And, as if to mark their approval of such doctrines, the Black Republicans of Ohio, the very next year, re-elected this disunionist to the Senate of the United States.

His brother, the Hon. Edward Wade, has, for a number of years, occupied a seat in the House of Representatives, and we find him, in a speech delivered in the House, August 2, 1856, indorsing the treasonable doctrines of his senatorial brother. We quote:—

“Sir, if the Constitution and the Union are to be used as instruments for propagating human

bondage, *they cannot be preserved—neither is it DESIRABLE THAT THEY SHOULD.* The spirit which has taken possession of the slaveholders, and their base tools, the Democracy of the free States, is the unclean spirit of slavery propagandism; and just as sure as animal life perishes in mephitic gases, so sure is it that the Constitution and Union **MUST PERISH** when smothered in the foul embraces of these allies of human slavery."

The Hon. Sidney Dean, of Connecticut, is in favor of dissolving the Union, unless freedom—that is, the freedom of the black race—shall be inaugurated in the country. We quote from a speech of his delivered in the House of Representatives, July 23, 1856:—

"The issue of all, the reason of all, the basis of all this lies in the simple question, shall freedom or slavery be the ruling, predominant feature of the model republic of the world? That question can be answered but in one way. Freedom, human, personal freedom, the fulfilment of the great sentiment 'that all men are created *free* and equal, and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights to life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness,' will be the national ruling of this country for future centuries, or the sun of its past glory *will set in drapery, CRIMSONED IN ITS OWN BLOOD, ere it reaches a century of its existence.*"

Now let us hear from Judge Rufus P. Spaulding, a delegate from Ohio to the Black Republican national conventions of 1856 and 1860. He made a speech in the convention of 1856, which nominated Fremont, in which he said:—

"In the case of the alternatives being presented, *of the continuance of slavery* or a dissolution of the Union, I **AM FOR DISSOLUTION**; and *I care not how quick it comes.*"

Hon. Horace Mann was once a member of Congress from Massachusetts, and a favorite elder in the Black Republican church. We quote from his speech in the House of Representatives:—

"I have only to add, under a full sense of my responsibility to my country and my God, I deliberately say, **BETTER DISUNION, BETTER A SERVILE WAR**, better anything that God in his Providence shall send, than an extension of the bonds of slavery."

Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, in a speech delivered in Faneuil Hall, Boston, November 2, 1855, said:—

"Not that I love the Union less, but freedom more, do I now, in pleading this great cause, insist that freedom, **AT ALL HAZARDS**, shall be preserved. God forbid, *that for the sake of the Union*, we should sacrifice the very thing for which the Union was made."

Still later, on the 19th and 20th of May, 1856, in a speech delivered in the Senate, Mr. Sumner held this revolutionary language:—

"Already the muster has begun. The strife is no longer local, but national. Even now while I speak, portents hang on all the arches of the horizon, threatening to darken the broad land, *which already yawns with the mutterings of CIVIL WAR.* The fury of the propagandists of slavery, and the calm determination of their opponents, are now diffused from the distant Territory over wide-spread communities, and the whole country in all its extent—marshalling hostile divisions, and foreshadowing a strife, which, unless happily averted by the triumph of freedom, *will become WAR—FRATRICIDAL, PARRICIDAL WAR*—with an accumulated wickedness beyond the wickedness of any war in human annals."

Following in the same strain, Senator Seward, in his speech in the Senate, April 9, 1856, jeered the South with the taunting menace that she should have no repose, but that rifles and cannons would take the place of words. Hear him:—

"The solemnity of the occasion draws over our heads that cloud of disunion which always arises whenever the subject of slavery is agitated. Still the debate goes on more ardently, earnestly, and angrily, than ever before. It employs now not merely logic, reproof, menace, retort, and defiance, **BUT SABRES, RIFLES, AND CANNON.** Do you look through this incipient war quite to the end, and see there peace, quiet, and harmony on the subject of slavery? If so, pray enlighten me, and show me how long the way is which leads to that repose. . . . He who found a river in his path, and sat down to wait for the flood to pass away, was not more unwise than he who expects the agitation of slavery to cease, while the love of freedom animates the bosoms of mankind."

After showing that this agitation will lead to war between the North and the South, Mr. Seward suggests to the Pacific States that then would be their time to withdraw from the Union. He continued:—

"Then the Free States and Slave States of the Atlantic, divided and warring with each other, would disgust the Free States of the Pacific, and they would have *abundant cause and justification for WITHDRAWING FROM A UNION* productive no longer of peace, safety, and liberty to themselves, and no longer holding up the cherished hopes of mankind."

Again, in his speech at Albany, October 12, 1855, Mr. Seward said:—

"Slavery is not, and can never be, perpetual. It will be overthrown either peacefully and lawfully under this Constitution, or it will work the subversion of the Constitution, together with its own overthrow. Then the **SLAVEHOLDERS WOULD PERISH IN THE STRUGGLE.**"

Again, in his speech in the Senate, March 11, 1850, Mr. Seward threatens the South with "civil war," unless they emancipate their slaves. He said:—

"When this answer shall be given, it will appear that the question of dissolving the Union is a complex question; that it embraces the fearful issue whether the Union shall stand, and slavery, under the steady, peaceful action of moral, social, and political causes, be removed by gradual, voluntary effort, and with compensation, *or whether the UNION SHALL BE DISSOLVED, AND CIVIL WARS ENSUE, bringing on VIOLENT BUT COMPLETE AND IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION.* We are now arrived at that stage when that crisis can be foreseen—when we must foresee it. It is directly before us. Its shadow is upon us."

In plain words, Mr. Seward says to the South: You can have union and the gradual emancipation of slavery, or you shall have disunion, civil war, and immediate emancipation! This, in plain English, was his proposition.

We next quote from a speech delivered in 1856, by the Hon. Francis E. Spinner, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York:—

"Should this [the election of Fremont] fail, no true man would be any longer safe here from the assaults of the arrogant slave oligarchy, who would then rule with an iron hand. For the free North would be left the choice of a peaceful DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION, A CIVIL WAR *which would end in the SAME*, or an unconditional surrender of every principle held dear by freemen."

To the same effect spoke that "bright and shining light" of Black Republicanism, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, in that celebrated speech of his in New Haven, in 1856, wherein he proclaimed that "Sharpe's rifle was truly a moral agency." Hear him:—

"The people will not levy war, nor inaugurate a revolution even to relieve Kansas, until they have first tried what they can do by voting. If this peaceful remedy should fail to be applied this year, then the people will count the cost wisely, and decide for themselves boldly and firmly which is the better way, TO RISE IN ARMS AND THROW OFF A GOVERNMENT *worse than that of old King George*, or endure it another four years, and then vote again."

In the same speech Mr. Beecher thus denounced the Constitution and the Union:—

"The Constitution is the cause of every division which this vexed question of slavery has ever occasioned in this country. It has been the fountain and father of our troubles, by attempting to hold together, as reconciled, two opposing principles, which will not harmonize, nor agree. The only hope of the slave is *over the ruins of the Government and of the American Church.* THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION is the abolition of slavery."

General James Watson Webb, the editor of that leading Black Republican Sheet, the "New York Courier and Enquirer," was a delegate to the convention that nominated Fremont, in 1856, and Lincoln, in 1860. In the former convention he made a speech, which was loudly applauded, but no sentence received more boisterous applause than the following:—

"Our people—loving order, loving law, and willing to abide by the ballot-box—come together from all parts of the Union and ask us to give them a nomination which, when fairly put before the people, will unite public sentiment, and through the ballot-box will restrain and repel this proslavery extension, and this aggression of the slaveocracy. What else are they doing? They tell you they are willing to abide by the ballot-box, and willing to make that last appeal. *If we fail there, what then? WE WILL DRIVE IT BACK, SWORD IN HAND, and, so help me God, believing that to be right, I am with them.* [Loud cheers, and cries of 'Good!'] Northern gentlemen, on your action depends the result. You may, with God's blessing, present to this country a name, rallying around it all the elements of the opposition, and thus we will become so strong that, through the ballot-box, we shall save the country. *But, if a name be presented on which we may not rally, and the consequence is CIVIL WAR—nothing more, nothing less, but civil war—I ask then, what is our first duty?*"

In the same strain spoke the Hon. Erastus Hopkins, another member of the convention. He said:—

"If peaceful means fail us, and we are driven to the last extremity, when ballots are useless, *then we will make BULLETS EFFECTIVE.*"

Hon. John P. Hale, of New Hampshire, was also a delegate to the convention, and addressed it in a long speech, in which he said:—

"He congratulated the convention upon the spirit of unanimity with which it had done its work. *I believe (said he) that this is not so much a convention to change the administration of the Government, AS TO SAY WHETHER THERE SHALL BE ANY GOVERNMENT TO BE ADMINISTERED. You have assembled, not to say whether this Union shall be preserved, but to say whether it shall be a blessing or a scorn and hissing among the nations.*"

As this gentleman is one of the main pillars in the Black Republican edifice, and has been twice elected by them to the United States Senate, we have examined his record pretty closely, as developed in his speeches in the Senate. On the 31st of May, 1848, he said:—

"Let the consequences be what they may, I am willing to place myself upon the great principle of human right; to stand where the Word of God and my own conscience concur in placing me, and there bid defiance to all consequences. And in the end, if this Union, bound as it is to the hearts

of the people by so many endearing associations, has no other principle of cement than the blood of human slavery, LET IT SUNDER."

Again, on the 12th of July, he said:—

"All the horrors of dissolution I can look steadfastly in the face, before I could look to that moral ruin which must fall upon us when we have so far prostituted ourselves as to become the pioneers of slavery in the Territories."

From another speech of Mr. Hale, delivered in the Senate, February 26, 1856, we extract the following blood-and-thunder morsel:—

"I thank God that the indications of the present day seem to promise that the North have at last got to the wall, and will go no further. I hope so. The Senator says there may be a power that shall say, 'Thus far shalt thou go, and no further.' Good! Good! Sir, I hope it will come; and if it comes to blood, LET BLOOD COME. No, sir, if that issue must come, LET IT COME, and it cannot come too soon. . . . Sir, Puritan blood has not always shrunk from even those encounters; and when the war has been proclaimed with the knife, and the knife to the hilt, THE STEEL HAS SOMETIMES GLISTENED IN THEIR HANDS; and when the battle was over, they were not always second best."

In the same vein do we find Mr. Carl Shurz, a delegate from Wisconsin to the Chicago Convention that nominated Mr. Lincoln, and now the most active Black Republican stump-jumper in the Northwest, speaking in St. Louis, only a few days ago:—

"May the God in human nature be aroused and pierce the very soul of our nation with an energy that shall sweep, as with the besom of destruction, this abomination of slavery from the land."

"You call this revolution. It is. In this we need revolution; we must, we will have it!"

"LET IT COME!"

Now hear Horace Greeley thunder forth his revolutionary advice to the Black Republicans in Congress, when the Kansas-Nebraska bill was pending:—

"We urge, therefore, unbending determination on the part of the Northern members hostile to this intolerable outrage, and demand of them, in behalf of peace, in behalf of freedom, in behalf of justice and humanity, resistance to the last. Better that confusion should ensue—better that discord should reign in the national councils—BETTER THAT CONGRESS SHOULD BREAK UP IN WILD DISCORD—nay better that the Capitol itself should blaze by the torch of the incendiary, OR FALL AND BURY ITS INMATES BENEATH ITS CRUMBLING RUINS, than that this perfidy and wrong shall be finally accomplished."

Among the documents published in 1856, and circulated by the Republican National Committee as a campaign document, we find a sermon preached by the Rev. Edmund H. Sears, at Wayland, Massachusetts, June 15, 1856 (it will be recollected that the clergy were very active for Fremont), from which we quote:—

"Out of the present crisis there are two paths that open before us, and only two. One is through violence and revolution. When the public organism has become possessed with the spirit of evil, and is used chiefly for its work, the last remedy is to BREAK IT IN PIECES, and let right and justice go free. REVOLUTION IS GOD'S REMEDY."

The Rev. Henry W. Bellows, of New York, is another political parson, who, at every election, throws off his clerical robes and takes the stump for the Black Republicans. He delivered a political sermon in 1856, which the Black Republican National Committee adopted and circulated as a Republican document. We quote from it:—

"Considered as a question of policy, it is by no means certain, that the dissolution of the Union would be a political evil to us. The Union is great, precious, sacred! but—yes! we must say it!—humanity, duty, honor, religion, are GREATER THAN THE UNION. This, then, is the unyielding ground of the Republican party—there is no evil possible to the country at this crisis as great as the extension of slavery. Dreadful as disunion is, the extension of slavery is still more dreadful. The dissolution of the Union, however deplorable, is not primarily a question of conscience, but of policy. We made the Union, and we have a right to unmake it if we choose."

Hear another political parson and Black Republican stump-jumper, the Rev. Dr. Kirk, of Boston:—

"The doctrine that a negro is not a man, and the doctrine that a negro is a man, have now come to the death struggle, and the nation will weave with every convulsive struggle of the contest. Neither will yield until a continent has been swept with the deluge of CIVIL WAR."

James S. Pike, the regular correspondent of the New York Tribune, and of course a most ardent Republican, thus pithily expressed his belief:—

"I have no doubt that the free and slave States ought to separate. THE UNION IS NOT WORTH SUPPORTING in connection with the South."

Take another gem from the speech of ex-Lieutenant Governor Ford, of Ohio, the Black Republican printer of the House of Representatives:—

"I love the Union, but the time has come when we must declare we love freedom BETTER THAN THE UNION."

We now come to Joshua R. Giddings, who, in a letter to Hon. Ralph Plumb, dated May 4, 1859, was in favor of overthrowing the Government in case the Supreme Court of Ohio would not take out of the custody of the United States, a band of Black Republicans who had forcibly taken some fugitive slaves out of the possession of the marshal and his deputies. Hear him :—

"I have great confidence in the judges composing that court. But should they prove unequal to the occasion, the case will then be taken to that highest of earthly tribunals, the source of all political power. The people finding this Government to have become 'destructive of the lives, the liberties, and the happiness of its citizens, will ALTER OR ABOLISH IT, and organize its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their SAFETY AND HAPPINESS.'

"This duty, so solemnly enjoined upon us by the founders of our Government, in that immortal charter of American liberty to which, for almost a century, we have been accustomed to look for instruction and direction in regard to our rights, WILL NOT BE NEGLECTED."

"Acts speak louder than words," says the old proverb. Let us see, then, how their "acts" tally with their words. On the 1st of February, 1850, Senator Hale presented two petitions from Isaac Jeffries and other citizens of Pennsylvania, and John T. Woodward and others, praying that "some plan might be devised *for the dissolution of the American Union.*" Mr. Webster, of Massachusetts, was unsparing in his denunciation of the petitions, and suggested that there should have been a preamble to them in these words :—

"Gentlemen, members of Congress, whereas, at the commencement of the session you and each of you took your solemn oaths, in the presence of God, and on the Holy Evangelists, that you would support the Constitution of the United States—now, therefore, we pray you to take immediate steps to break up the Union, and overthrow the Constitution as soon as you can."

Yet it received *three* votes, and *only three*, being the votes of every Black Republican Senator then in the Senate, to wit: John P. Hale of New Hampshire, William H. Seward of New York, and Salmon P. Chase of Ohio. See Senate Journal, 1st session, 31st Congress, page 129.

On the 25th of February, the same petitions were offered in the House of Representatives by Joshua R. Giddings, where it received *eight* votes, being the Abolition vote in that body, to wit: Charles Allen of Massachusetts, Charles Durkee of Wisconsin, now one of the Black Republican United States Senators from that State, Joshua R. Giddings of Ohio, Rufus K. Goodenow of Maine, George W. Julian of Indiana, now the Black Republican candidate for Congress in the fifth congressional district of that State, Preston King of New York, now a Black Republican United States Senator from that State, a delegate to the Chicago Convention that nominated Lincoln, and chairman of the Republican National Executive Committee, and J. M. Root of Ohio; every one of whom is a supporter of Lincoln and Hamlin.

Who, after this, will be so fool-hardy as to deny that the Republican party is the disunion party of this country? It is to this end they have for years been schooling and inciting the public mind of the North. It is to this end they have been fomenting strifes, stirring up discord, erecting an "irrepressible conflict," between the people of both sections. It is to this end they have been inflaming the southern people with their villainous abuse and vituperation, so that their erimination might lead to recrimination, and bitterness and hatred be exchanged for fraternal regard and affection. It is to this end they have been inciting the negroes of the South to insurrection and rebellion, so as to keep the southern people in a state of irritation and alarm. It is to this end they sent John Brown to Harper's Ferry, to murder defenceless men and women. It is to this end they got up their "sympathy" meetings, and sought to deify this cold-blooded murderer and traitor. The man must be blind indeed, who does not see, in all these movements, the bloody and brutal programme of disunion, civil war, and servile insurrection.

Oh, let us turn from this dark picture, and drink the words of patriotism and warning that issue from Mount Vernon's sacred tomb. Here is the duty enjoined upon every lover of his country by the matchless Washington :—

"To properly estimate the immense value of your National Union, to your collective and individual happiness, you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourself to think and to speak of it as a palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with zealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

CONCLUSION.

It will be perceived that we have made no quotations from that still more ultra and extreme portion of the Republican party led by Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Abby Foster, Gerrit Smith, Redpath & Co., who have the merit of being more out-spoken, bold, and violent in their assaults upon the Constitution and the Union; for the reason that, though voting with that party, yet some of the Republican leaders in some of the States, such as Indiana, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, where Black Republicanism is of slow growth, affect to deny their authority to speak for the Republican party. So, in these papers, we have confined ourselves strictly to quotations from the *representative men—the admitted leaders—the endorsed and everywhere acknowledged founders, creators, and nurses, advocates, and chief supporters* of the Republican party—the men who made this party, whose talents sustain, whose counsels direct, whose acts control it. No man can gainsay their authority to speak for it, for they themselves constitute the party. We have made fair and honest quotations from their speeches and letters. And now look upon the record. What does it all mean? *The dissolution of the American Union, the emancipation of the Southern slaves, and the reduction of the Southern States and Southern men into the abject position of colonies and vassals.* This is the "bloody goal" at which Black Republicanism strives. And what is the lesson this brutal programme ought to instil into the hearts of conservative men of the North? We unhesitatingly answer, **UNION FOR THE SAKE OF THE UNION.** When bad men combine, good men ought to unite; and when the bloody banner of fanaticism is unfurled to the breeze, and when treason, grown audacious and defiant, no longer skulks in secret, but with shameless front proclaims its principles and objects to the world, it is high time for the friends of law and order at the North to rally around the Constitution, and to raise aloft the flag of the Union, while yet we have a Constitution, a Union, and a flag, and before these Black Republican revolutionists succeed in inaugurating a reign of terror like the carnage of St. Domingo, and before the Republic of North America, rent into fragments, has become a thing of the past, a fact only in the page of history. There is but one political organization in this country that has the power to resist and roll back the waves of fanaticism. That organization is the National Democratic party. Firmly planted in the hearts of the American people, descended from the purer and better days of this Republic, contemporary with Washington, and Jefferson, and Jackson, it stands forth to-day, as it has ever stood the champion of the Constitution and the Union. It has encountered and overthrown the Black Republican disunion party upon one battle-field. Let the conservative men of the country now rally to its standard, and it will again meet, overthrow, and vanquish this dangerous enemy to the Republic, and give peace and security to the Union.

 WASHINGTON:

ISSUED BY THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

